

REMARKS

The Examiner requests that Figures 2, 5 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. Replacement drawings are submitted herewith with such designation.

Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita et al (USPN 5,124,204) in view of Wu et al (USPN 6,876,148). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita et al (USPN 5,124,204) in view of Wu et al (USPN 6,876,148) and further in view of Antoniadis et al (USPN 6,366,017). Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested in view of the present amendments and following comments.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of dependent claim 15, by specifying that the substrate or cover comprises a composite of a glass layer and a metal layer. Claims 2, 11, 12, 15 and 18 have accordingly been cancelled, and claims 6-9, 13, 14 and 16 have accordingly been amended.

Yamashita et al. teaches the use of a sealing sheet 12 including a moisture-proof sheet 13 comprising two organic polymer films 22 and a metal film 21 in manufacture of a thin film electroluminescent panel. The Examiner acknowledges (as to the rejection of original claim 15) that Yamashita et al do not disclose use of a composite substrate or cover in accordance with the present invention comprising a non-metallic layer made of a glass layer, but argues that it would have been matter of obvious alternative design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art to choose either any suitable glass or plastic for encapsulating the device, since both glass and plastic are obvious alternatives for encapsulating the device. Yamashita et al., however, specifically teaches that use of a glass cover results in thick and heavy EL panels (col. 1, lines 29-32), and Yamashita et al.'s invention is directed towards fabrication of thin film EL panels that are thin, light, and low cost (col. 1, lines 43-45), at least in part through use of the sealing sheet 12 as a replacement for glass covers as taught in the prior art. Thus, substitution of a glass layer for the polymeric layers 22 of Yamashita et al would not have been obvious, but rather is specifically taught against, as it would defeat the

purpose (providing a thin, light panel) of the Yamashita et al. invention. Further, the metal film 21 is employed in Yamashita et al. to provide moisture-proof properties (col. 2, lines 41-43), which function is not required when employing a glass layer, so there in any event would be no reason based on Yamashita et al to retain the metal layer 21 if the polymeric layers 22 were to be replaced with a glass layer. Wu et al does disclose use of a heat spreader in an organic light-emitting panel, but teaches use of such heat spreader around a printed circuit board 11, rather than use of a composite substrate or encapsulating cover itself comprising a glass layer and a metal layer. Accordingly, the present invention is clearly patentable over the cited prior art, and reconsideration of this rejection with respect to present claims 1, 3-10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 is respectfully requested.

While all claims are believed patentable for the reasons discussed above, it is additionally noted that the further features of claim 10 (wherein the metal layer is non-contiguous) would further not be suggested by Yamashita et al as a non-contiguous metal layer would not provide moisture-proof encapsulation, which is the function of the metal layer 21 of Yamashita et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. A prompt and favorable action by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe any remaining issues may be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative at the number below to discuss such issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,564

Andrew J. Anderson/vjr

Rochester, NY 14650

Telephone: (585) 722-9662

Faxsimile: (585) 477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.

Amendments to the Drawings:

Submitted herewith are 3 sheets of replacement drawings, with Figs. 2 and 5 designated as "Prior Art" as requested by the Examiner. Please substitute such replacement drawings for those originally filed.